



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

thought does not coincide with or permit the comparative and critical study of the sources and subjects of modern literature. And the specialist in this line will also often find them a convenient jog to a tardy memory.—To quote from the preface to the *Legends*:

"Many allusions in the literature of our own day lose much of their force simply because these legends are not available to the general reader."

but he has them here in attractive and convenient analyses.

The outlines are told in direct but not childish language, and the mature reader will not feel that he is consulting a boy's story book when turning to these interesting pages for information. At the same time, Miss Guerber has treated the many *risqué* incidents in medieval narrative with great tact: Nothing of the story is mutilated, but nothing which might excite the fancy of the youthful reader has been included. I refer, for one example among many, to the story of Tristan and Iseult and the power of the love potion. Exception might be taken, as departing from the scope of the work, to the space devoted to the "Story of Frithiof," which is but little more than a synopsis of Tegnér's poem. To be sure it is preceded by an outline of the Thorsten saga, but yet it seems to me that this chapter is inconsistent with the usual apparent practice of the author of drawing her outlines after the original.

The influence of the themes of Northern and medieval myth and legend upon modern literature is shown in both volumes by frequent quotations from Tennyson, William Morris, Longfellow and others, illustrative of statements in the text. Excellent indexes enhance the value of the volumes as books of reference. In general, it must be said that it is very refreshing to find such pleasant and useful work performed so modestly (see the prefaces) and so well that one does not notice the great labor that has been required.

A word concerning the illustrations, since they form so large a part of the attraction of the book for younger readers: They are nearly all reproductions of works by good, even celebrated, artists, and in many cases will serve to impress the text upon the reader.

It is a pity that the indifferent pictures by Pixis have been included. Is it, perhaps, the fault of the half-tone reproduction that the beautiful Iseult is so unattractive? Decided objection must be made to one or two pictures as being misleading. For instance, "Parzival uncovering the Holy Grail" is evidently a scene from Wagner's dramatic opera, and is only mystifying to any one who tries to connect it with the text of the book referring to Parzival's elevation to the guardianship of the Grail. Another instance will serve to show what discrimination is necessary in choosing ready-made illustrations. On p. 130 of *Myths* we read:

"Freya herself, like all the heathen divinities, was declared a demon or witch, and banished to the mountain peaks of Norway, Sweden, or Germany, where the Brocken is pointed out as her special abode, and the general trysting place of her demon train on Valpurgisnacht."

The illustration to this is a reproduction, under the title of "The Witches' Dance," of von Kreling's picture of the following from the *Brockenscene in Faust*:

"Mephisto, siehst du dort  
Ein blasses, schönes Kind allein und ferne stehen?" etc.,  
with Faust and Mephistopheles in the foreground regarding the apparition!

GEORGE STUART COLLINS.

*Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn.*

## THE COLLINGHAM RUNIC INSCRIPTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In his article in the June number of this Journal, Professor Hempl incidentally treats of the "exceedingly valuable" Collingham inscription, which he reads:—*æftar answini cu(ning)*. His authorities are (1) Stephens's figure (ii, *recte* i, 391) and (2) the report of Haigh (Stephens iii, 183). As to Stephens's figure, the first rune on the right side may be read either  $\mathfrak{F}$  a or  $\mathfrak{O}$  o, it being impossible to tell whether the short line that would complete the  $\mathfrak{F}$  is an intentional up-stroke, or part of the hatching of the surface. Stephens, for whom the drawing was made, says that  $\mathfrak{F}$ , not  $\mathfrak{O}$ , is meant. The figure, then, represents the reading *æftar onswini cu. . .* The reading

of Haigh given by Stephens (iii, 183) as *æfter auswini*, is according to Hempl, misprinted for *æftar answini*. Having at present no access to Haigh's paper on *The Runic Monuments of Northumbria* (1870), from which Stephens quotes, I cannot verify Hempl's correction. At all events Haigh's *u* in *auswini* does not appear for the first time in Stephens's misprint, *auswini*—or rather the runic  $\mathfrak{F} \mathfrak{N} \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{I}$ —also occurring in Haigh's *Conquest of Britain*, plate ii, fig. 5 (1861). The prominence given by Stephens (i, 391) to the fact that his reading of "the second rune in the name" as  $\mathfrak{I}$  *u* had been confirmed by Mr. Denny and some other gentlemen, in 1862, also seems to show that the rune in question had been differently explained in the reading of Haigh to which Stephens (*l. c.*) refers. Be that as it may, we certainly have, so far, three distinct readings of the pretended "name":—(1) *auswini*, read by Haigh; (2) *onswini*, corrected from (1) by Stephens; (3) Hempl's (and at one time Haigh's?) *answini*.

Only after writing his article, Professor Hempl came across my *Northumbrische Runensteine*. As my account and photographs of the Collingham inscription do not agree with Professor Hempl's reading *æftar answini cu(n)ing*, or the theory expounded in his article either, it is only natural that he does not see them in a favorable light. He says that it is evident from my book "that the Collingham cross has weathered badly since seen by Stephens, Haigh, etc." To this I would reply that Stephens, *who had not seen the cross*, did not find any more runes in the photographs and rubbings sent to him in 1862, than I have been able to discover in the original and in my photographs and rubbings in 1895-6, that he calls the *c* "very indistinct," and the *u* "not quite plain," and that, as we have seen, he disagrees with Haigh as to the first two runes in the so-called name; whereas Haigh, whose "restorations" of the inscription can hardly be taken seriously, admits that

"the traces of letters are not nearly so plain on the casts of 1870 as on those of 1855, for the surface of the stone has suffered from the exposure during this interval" (Stephens iii, 183),

<sup>1</sup> Incomplete form of the  $\mathfrak{I}$  rune, with by-stroke only on the right side.

so that his later reading ought to be regarded with even greater caution than the former.\* My own reading, which Professor Hempl through some misprint gives as *æft(ær ærp)-swi(hun)* instead of *æft(ær || ær)swip(hun)*, rests upon the original, several brush rubbings, and the photographs reproduced by me, plate v, figs. 13 and 14. Of these photographs Professor Hempl remarks that they "are unfortunate, the left side being perfectly black and the right illegible." That the runes on the left side are "almost completely covered by the deep shade" I regret myself (*l. c.*, p. 20). Those on the right side are, however, hardly more "illegible" in the photograph than in the original. As to "the two distinct black strokes of the first rune on the right (which make it look like  $\mathfrak{F}$  rather than  $\mathfrak{F}$ )" Professor Hempl declares that they "are evidently the work of the re-toucher's pencil or of accidental scratches on the negative." To this I answer:—(1) They are *not* "the work of the re-toucher's pencil." How could they be? Mr. Thawley of Leeds, the photographer employed by me, of course not knowing or caring anything about  $\mathfrak{F}$ ,  $\mathfrak{F}$ ,  $\mathfrak{F}$ , or any possible meaning of the inscription before him, could not have put in those two strokes on his own account. Surely Professor Hempl does not mean to say that the photographer had put them in at my direction! (2) They *are* on the negative, but *not* as "accidental scratches." They are on the rubbings, and they are on the original. I am going to have one of my rubbings photographed, and will send a copy to Professor Hempl and to any other scholar seriously interested in the question that will apply to me. From that photograph it will be clearly seen that what I say of the Collingham runes (*l. c.*, p. 20) is borne out by the facts; more especially, that in the first rune on the right side there is no trace of up-strokes, (as in  $\mathfrak{F}$ ,  $\mathfrak{F}$ ), and that the second rune cannot have been  $\mathfrak{I}$ , or any other one stave rune, whereas  $\mathfrak{N}$  is not quite impossible, though much less probable than ( $\mathfrak{B}$  or)  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

WILHELM VIETOR.

Marburg (Germany).

<sup>2</sup> As to Haigh's trustworthiness, see my *Runensteine*, passim; for example, p. 15, note r.